REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 8 stand rejected upon informalities. Claims 1-21 stand rejected on prior art grounds. Applicants respectfully traverse these objections/rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aguilar, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,199,137) in view of Garland, et al. 6,389,120. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

A. The Rejection Based on Aguilar in View of Garland

Regarding independent claims 1, 8, and 15, and related dependent claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-21, first, the references, separately, or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a reason or motivation for being combined.

Second, even assuming that the references would have been combined, Aguilar, et al. ("Aguilar") does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1, and similarly independent claims 8 and 15, including at least one selector connected to the serial lanes, whereby the selector selectively engages the serial lanes to alter a speed of data passing through the core. (See Page 7, lines 10-19; Page 10, line 4-Page 11, line 2; Page 18, lines 10-20; and Figure 2B).

Indeed, the Examiner admits that Aguilar "do[es] not teach selector selectively engages the serial lanes to alter speed of data passing through the core," and thus, Aguilar is deficient by not disclosing the above feature of Applicant's claimed invention. (See Office Action, Page 3, lines 7-8).

Garland is also deficient.

In contrast, Figures 1-3 of Garland merely disclose a method, and related apparatus, for delivery of information over multiple suppressed ringing physical channels, including a router/multiplexer 202 receiving channels of data from servers 204, 206, where the router/multiplexer 202 (what the Examiner attempts to analogize to Applicant's multiplexer 215, 236 inside the core) connects the channels of data to trunks 210, which are connected to a server termination switch 106. Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Garland only discloses a simple router 202 completely outside the core, and thus the router 202 "may route channels of information from both servers 204, 206" via the trunks. However, the router 202 does not perform a switching function to alter the speed of data passing through the core like Applicant's invention. Indeed, Garland is specifically focused on providing a plurality of channels for data communications to address "the complexity of control required to coordinate use of multiple phone lines" and does not disclose or teach any switching function. Thus, element 202 is clearly a simple router outside the core, and thus Garland does not teach or suggest at least one selector connected to the serial lanes, whereby the selector selectively engages the serial lanes to alter a speed of data passing through the core. (See Garland at Abstract; Paragraph 1, lines 25-65; Column 3, line 60-Column 4, line 30; and Figures 1-3).

For emphasis, Applicant teaches a core for providing communications between a transmission media 280 and a processor 246 where the core includes multiplexers 215, 236 connected to elastic FIFOs 220, 230 where the multiplexers 215, 236 selectively engage a different number of data lanes 225 (e.g., alter the lane width) in order to perform a speed reduction between the transmission media 280 and the ASIC 246. Accordingly, the invention is applicable to any form of speed reduction that is enabled by selectively engaging different number of data lanes, and thus switching occurs in the core. (See above).

In contrast, Garland, as indicated above, only teaches a router outside the core where the router does not perform any switching function, that is, selectively engaging different number of data lanes. In other words, Garland uses the multiplexer as a router to select between different servers, while the claimed invention uses a multiplexer to select between serial lanes to alter the speed of data passing through the core. Thus, Applicant traverses the assertion that Garland

teaches Applicant's invention.

For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Aguilar nor Garland, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest, including at least one selector connected to the serial lanes, whereby the selector selectively engages the serial lanes to alter a speed of data passing through the core as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly independent claims 8 and 15, of Applicant's invention.

For the reasons stated above, the claimed invention, and the invention as cited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15, and related dependent claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-21, is fully patentable over the cited references.

III. Formal Matters and Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-21, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary.

Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/8/04

McGinn & Gibb, P.C.
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Customer Number: 29154

Fredric J. Zimmerman
Registration No. 48,747